

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL WELDON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JERRY DYER, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-00540-LJO-SAB  
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
PROTECTIVE ORDER  
ECF NO. 83

On October 9, 2014, Plaintiff Paul Weldon (“Plaintiff”) filed a motion requesting a protective order prohibiting Defendants from conducting a videotaped deposition of Plaintiff. (ECF No. 83.) Plaintiff informs the Court that Defendants noticed a deposition of Plaintiff to take place on November 4, 2014. Plaintiff contends that the deposition is improper because the deposition serves no purpose other than to harass Plaintiff.

The Court is not persuaded by Plaintiff’s argument. While depositions may be inconvenient, all litigants who file lawsuits in court must face the prospect of being deposed, just as the Defendants in this action may be deposed by Plaintiff, if so desired. Plaintiff’s contention that a deposition would have no purpose is without merit. Defendants are entitled to question Plaintiff regarding the circumstances of his claims and the nature of his damages. Contrary to Plaintiff’s arguments otherwise, Plaintiff’s damages are not “self-evident.” Plaintiff contends that he feels uncomfortable at the prospect of being “put under the microscope” in a deposition.

